



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,895	12/14/2001	Jie Sun	12583.21US01	1959
23552	7590	02/27/2003	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			TSAI, CAROL S W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2857		
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/021,895	SUN ET AL. <i>(initials)</i>
	Examiner Carol S Tsai	Art Unit 2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-93 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-93 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachments(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ .                    6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims 1, 32, and 63 recite no clearly defined practical application of the claimed method or do not draw a conclusion as to the final end result of the model mathematical operation being directed toward a practical application. Additionally, the method claims do not fall into either of the “safe harbors” defined in the Guidelines for Computer-Implemented Inventions in that there is no manipulation of measured data representing physical objects or activities to achieve a practical application (pre-computer process activity) or the performance of independent physical acts (post-computer process activity). The examiner submits that the claimed process merely solves a model mathematical problem without limitation to a practical application.

Claim 1 recites signal analysis that is not tied to any physical structure for receiving, transmitting or constructing the data signal. The Examiner submits that the claimed method consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea is not concrete or tangible.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in–  
(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or  
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 32-36, 39, 40, 63-67, 70, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Publication 2003/0004664 to Ward et al.

With respect to claims 1, 9, 32, 40, 63, and 71, Ward et al. disclose a method of analyzing a measurable distribution having random components and deterministic components, comprising the steps of: (a) collecting data from a data source (data waveform 100 shown on Fig. 1) (see paragraph 0018); (b) constructing a probability density function based on the data such that the probability density function defines a distribution, wherein the probability density function is a convolution of deterministic functions and random functions (total jitter 120 shown on Fig. 1) (see Figs. 4, 6, 7, and 10 and paragraphs 0003, 0007, 0026, 0028, and 0036); (c) construct a probability density function based on a convolution model having three or more parameters wherein at least one of the parameters are unknown, the convolution model having a deterministic model and a random model (see Figs. 6 and 7; Abstract, lines 5-7; and paragraphs 0003, 0007, 0018, 0037, 0038, and 0042); (d) determining unknown parameters by using a deconvolution process (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 0018, 0020, and 0036-0047).

As to claims 2, 33, and 64, Ward et al. also disclose the deterministic model having a deterministic parameter and the random model having two or more random parameters (see Figs. 3 and 10 and paragraphs 0037-0046).

As to claims 3, 34, and 65, Ward et al. also disclose the deterministic parameter being time location (see paragraphs 0004, 0021, and 0037).

As to claims 4, 35, and 66, Ward et al. also disclose the deterministic model has at least one time location parameter and at least one magnitude parameter (see Figs. 6 and 7 and paragraphs 0004, 0021, 0036, and 0037).

As to claims 5, 36, and 67, Ward et al. also disclose formulating an inverse problem; and solving the inverse problem to extract the parameters (see paragraph 0037).

As to claims 8, 39, and 70, Ward et al. also disclose the distribution being a signal distribution (see paragraphs 0002, 0007, 0030, and 0034).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 7, 37, 38, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al. in view of U. S. 2001/0036228 to Skafidas et al.

As noted above, with respect to claims 6, 37, and 68, Ward et al. disclose the claimed invention, except for the inverse problem being solved via a recursive solution.

Skafidas et al. teach the inverse problem being solved via a recursive solution (see paragraph 0034).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ward et al.'s method to include the inverse problem being solved via a recursive solution, as taught by Skafidas et al., in order that an estimate of original data can be recovered by demodulating the estimated modulated data (see Skafidas et al., paragraph 0011, lines 14-16).

As to claims 7, 38, and 69, Ward et al. do not disclose the inverse problem being solved via an optimizer based solution.

Skafidas et al. teach the inverse problem being solved via an optimizer based solution (see paragraphs 0056-0063).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ward et al.'s method to include the inverse problem being solved via an optimizer based solution, as taught by Skafidas et al., in order that data received from a communications channel can be equalized and distortion and noise from the data can be removed (see Skafidas et al., paragraph 0002, lines 3-5).

6. Claims 10-14, 17-19, 21-25, 28-30, 41-45, 48-50, 52-56, 59-61, 72-76, 79-81, 83-87, and 90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al. in view of U. S. 2002/0003843 to Martone.

As noted above, with respect to claims 10, 18, 21, 29, 41, 49, 52, 60, 72, 80, 83, and 91, Ward et al. disclose the claimed invention, except for at least one random model parameter is

known, wherein the determining step further comprises the step of: determining a deterministic model parameter based on the known random model parameter by using a deconvolution process.

Martone teaches at least one random model parameter is known, wherein the determining step further comprises the step of: determining a deterministic model parameter based on the known random model parameter by using a deconvolution process (see paragraph 0070).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ward et al.'s method to include at least one random model parameter is known, wherein the determining step further comprises the step of: determining a deterministic model parameter based on the known random model parameter by using a deconvolution process, as taught by Martone, in order that a jitter correction can be provided to minimize signal measuring inaccuracy effects in a signal processing system.

As to claims 11, 22, 42, 53, 73, and 84, Ward et al. also disclose the deterministic model having a deterministic parameter and the random model having two or more random parameters (see Figs. 3 and 10 and paragraphs 0037-0046).

As to claims 12, 23, 43, 54, 74, and 85, Ward et al. also disclose the deterministic parameter being time location (see paragraphs 0004, 0021, and 0037).

As to claims 13, 24, 44, 55, 75, and 86, Ward et al. also disclose the deterministic model has at least one time location parameter and at least one magnitude parameter (see Figs. 6 and 7 and paragraphs 0004, 0021, 0036, and 0037).

As to claims 14, 19, 25, 30, 45, 50, 56, 61, 76, 81, 87, and 92, Ward et al. also disclose formulating an inverse problem; and solving the inverse problem to extract the parameters (see paragraph 0037).

As to claims 17, 28, 48, 59, 79, and 90, Ward et al. also disclose the distribution being a signal distribution (see paragraphs 0002, 0007, 0030, and 0034).

7. Claims 15, 16, 26, 27, 46, 47, 57, 58, 77, 78, 88, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al. in view of Martone as applied to claims 1, 10, 14, 21, 25, 32, 41, 45, 52, 56, 63, 72, 76, 83, and 87, above, and further in view of U. S. 2001/0036228 to Skafidas et al.

As noted above, with respect to claims 15, 26, 46, 57, 77, and 88, Ward et al. in combination with Martone teach all the features of the claimed invention, but do not disclose the inverse problem being solved via a recursive solution.

Skafidas et al. teaches the inverse problem being solved via a recursive solution (see paragraph 0034).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ward et al. in combination with Martone's method to include the inverse problem being solved via a recursive solution, as taught by Skafidas et al., in order that an estimate of original data can be recovered by demodulating the estimated modulated data (see Skafidas et al., paragraph 0011, lines 14-16).

As to claims 16, 27, 47, 58, 78, and 89, Ward et al. in combination with Martone do not disclose the inverse problem being solved via an optimizer based solution.

Skafidas et al. teach the inverse problem being solved via an optimizer based solution (see paragraphs 0056-0063).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ward et al. in combination with Martone's method to include the inverse problem being solved via an optimizer based solution, as taught by Skafidas et al., in order that data received from a communications channel can be equalized and distortion and noise from the data can be removed (see Skafidas et al., paragraph 0002, lines 3-5).

8. Claims 20, 31, 51, 62, 82, and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al. in view of Martone as applied to claims 1, 10, 18, 19, 21, 29, 30, 32, 41, 49, 50, 52, 53, 60, 61, 63, 72, 80, 81, 83, 91, and 92 above, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,028,895 to Dinsed et al.

As noted above, with respect to claims 20, 31, 51, 62, 82, and 93, Ward et al. in combination with Martone teach all the features of the claimed invention, but do not disclose the inverse problem being solved via a closed solution.

Dinsed et al. teach the inverse problem being solved via a closed solution (see col. 1, line 38 to col. 2, line 29).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ward et al. in combination with Martone's method to include the inverse problem being solved via a closed solution, as taught by Dinsed et al., because a non-recursive structure can be utilized to avoid introducing errors into the results of the measurement

by component tolerance, aging phenomena and temperature variations contributed to the high precision.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Li et al. disclose a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture for analyzing measurements.

Tsui et al. disclose method and apparatus for non-invasive testing of digital communications systems.

Kadtke et al. disclose a signal detection and classification technique that provides robust decision criteria for a wide range of parameters and signals strongly in the presence of noise and interfering signals.

Lo discloses a robust neural system for robust processing for averting unacceptable or disastrous processing performances.

Behrin discloses a method and apparatus for generating a data signal from a transmitted data signal that has been distorted by duty cycle jitter.

Marimont et al. disclose a data structure representation of an original image called an image structure map (ISM) accurately, compactly and explicitly representing the geometry, topology and signal properties of regions in an original image.

Allison et al. disclose an improved signal processing method in a signal processor for performing the deconvolution of a signal resulting from an analytical separation process.

Dunkel discloses using regression analysis, n-dimensional spectral and imaging data from sources including Nuclear Magnetic Resonance or Electron Spin Resonance spectrometers, that can be automatically analyzed and the data acquisition equipment or the data itself that can be corrected for various determined types of distortion.

Guo et al. disclose apparatus and methods for modifying an incoming binary serial data stream to reduce the Duty Cycle Distortion jitter which involves comparing the time between adjacent transitions and correcting the jitter by inserting delay before the early transition for reducing the peak-to-peak distribution of said jitter.

***Contact Information***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carol S. Tsai whose telephone number is (703) 305-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S. Hoff can be reached on (703) 308-1677. The fax number for TC 2800 is (703) 308-7382. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2800 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 2800 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group at (703) 308-7382. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the

Art Unit: 2857

examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 2800 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Carol S. Tsai

02/10/03

